

FILED

11/26/2009

Judge Jamie D. Happas

WILLIAMS CUKER BEREZOFSKY

Woodland Falls Corporate Center
210 Lake Drive East, Suite 101
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002
(856) 667-0500

WATTS GUERRA CRAFT LLP

555 North Carancahua
Tower II, 14th Floor
Corpus Christi, Texas 78478
(361) 887-0500

Attorneys for Plaintiff.

CINDY SIMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORTHO-McNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC.; JOHNSON & JOHNSON; JOHNSON &
JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.
f/k/a R.W. JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH INSTITUTE, JANE DOE
DISTRIBUTORS (1-50); JILL DOE
MANUFACTURERS (1-50); JACK DOE
WHOLESALERS (1-50); JAKE DOE
SELLERS (1-50); JOHN DOE MARKETERS
(1-50); JOAN DOE FORMULATORS (1-50);
JIM DOE HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS (1-
50); and JEAN DOE (1-50),

Defendants.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

Docket No. MID-L-9532-06 MT

CIVIL ACTION

**IN RE ORTHO EVRA BIRTH CONTROL
PATCH LITIGATION**

CASE CODE: 275

ORDER

THIS MATTER having been opened to the Court by application of Esther Berezofsky,
Esquire, attorney for Plaintiff, for an Order granting leave for Williams Cuker Berezofsky and

Watts Guerra Craft LLP to withdraw as counsel for the plaintiff, and the Court having considered the moving papers, and any opposition thereto, and for good cause having been shown,

IT IS, on this 26th day of June, 2009,

ORDERED that the motion for leave for Williams Cuker Berezofsky and Watts Guerra Craft LLP to withdraw as counsel for the plaintiff in the within action be and is hereby **GRANTED**; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all proceedings including discovery, in this matter shall be stayed pending substitution of counsel, but in no event more than _____ days of the date of this Order; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of the within Order shall be served on all counsel and plaintiff within 7 days of the date of this Order.



J.S.C.

Papers Considered:

- ☒ Notice of Motion
- ☒ Movant's Affidavits
- ☐ Movant's Brief
- ☐ Answering Affidavits
- ☐ Answering Brief
- ☐ Cross-Motion
- ☐ Movant's Reply
- ☐ Other

Having reviewed the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R.1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.